

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
CITY OF LIVONIA
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2024**

A Meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Livonia was held on Tuesday, November 19, 2024.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Baringhaus, Vice Chairman
Christopher Boloven
Michael Testa
Marc Rotondo
Lynda Scheel
Timothy Klisz, Secretary

MEMBERS ABSENT: Gregory G. Coppola, Chairman

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Fisher, Chief Assistant City Attorney
Zac Winkler, Building Inspector

The meeting was called to order at seven p.m. Vice Chairman Baringhaus explained the Rules of Procedure to those interested parties. Each petitioner must give their name and address and declare hardship for appeal. Appeals of the Zoning Board's decisions are made to the Wayne County Circuit Court. The Chairman advised the audience that appeals can be filed within 21 days of the date tonight's minutes are approved. The decision of the Zoning Board shall become final within five (5) calendar days following the hearing and the applicant shall be mailed a copy of the decision. There are four decisions the Board can make: To deny, to grant, to grant as modified by the Board, or to table for further information. Each Petitioner may ask to be heard by a full seven (7) member Board. Six (6) members were present.

BARINGHAUS: We have six of seven members. To be awarded the variance a petitioner must receive four votes, or five of six member votes in a use variance case, excuse me, Mr. Fisher, we have some use variances on the agenda this evening?

FISHER Yes, we do. The second case tonight is the use variance case.

BARINGHAUS Thank you very much. And like I mentioned, you must receive four votes or five of six members in a use variance case in favor of a variance petition. If you wish to be heard by the full Board, we will be happy to reschedule you to our next available meeting, although there is no certainty there will be a full Board at any meeting. That particular meeting would be for February 11, 2025. Is there anybody else that would like to reschedule at this point?

DURAND How many votes do we need for a six member Board?

BARINGHAUS I'm sorry?

DURAND How many votes do you need?

BARINGHAUS As I indicated, for use variance that would take five of six members. For just a general variance, a Petitioner would need to receive four of six votes. In other words, majority.

DURAND With seven members, it's how many?

BARINGHAUS Four. Four is a majority.

DURAND Yeah.

BARINGHAUS For a use variance, which is the second case, will require five votes.

Secretary, Timothy Klisz, then read the Agenda and Legal Notice to each appeal, and each Petitioner indicated their presence. Appeals came up for hearing after due legal notice was given to all interested parties within 300 feet, petitioners, and City Departments. There were several (not counted) people present in the audience.

(7:00)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPEAL CASE #	PAGES
APPEAL CASE NO. 2024-08-29 TODAL LLC 38019-38035 Schoolcraft Road	4-22
APPEAL CASE NO. 2024-09-32 Brian Durand 20132 Osmus Avenue	23-38
APPEAL CASE NO. 2024-10-33 The Cornelia Group, LLC On behalf of Lessee PAG Michigan 165, LLC 27777 Schoolcraft Road	39-46
ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS	47-48

APPEAL CASE NO. 2024-08-29, TODAL, LLC, 38019-38035 Schoolcraft (Tabled on October 1, 2024): seeking to occupy a property in the M-2 (General Manufacturing) Zoning District to establish a religious institution, which is prohibited.

This Tech and Manufacturing property is located on the south side of Schoolcraft Road (38019-38035), between Waco Road and Newburgh Road, Lot. No. 117-02-0009-006, M-2, General Manufacturing, rejected by the Inspection Department under Livonia Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.17 (Permitted and Prohibited Uses).

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Are there any questions for the Inspection Department? Does the Board have any questions for the Law Department?

KLISZ Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yes. Secretary Klisz.

KLISZ Question for Mr. Fisher. Is this case, since it is like a construction project and all that kind of stuff, does it go to Planning and Zoning, and therefore, I don't think it's been there, would it go to [them] after us? Do they have to meet [a] certain threshold first?

FISHER Generally speaking, there are no requirements of that nature in M-2 districts, is my understanding.

KLISZ Okay.

FISHER And I guess even if there were, this is a situation where we might do the variance first because there is no, yeah, there's no use to talk about it.

KLISZ Gotcha. Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Okay, very good. The Chair will entertain a motion to remove the case from the table.

KLISZ Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Secretary Klisz.

KLISZ I move to remove Appeal Case No. 2024-08-29, from the table.

BARINGHAUS Is there support?

BOLOVEN Support.

BARINGHAUS Motion by Secretary Klisz, support by Mr. Boloven to remove case number 2024-08-29 from the table. Any discussion? All those in favor say, "aye."

The Board voted unanimously to remove the case from the table.

BARINGHAUS Okay. The case is removed. Will the Petitioner come forward, please?
Good evening.

WILLIAMS Good evening.

BARINGHAUS State your name and address, please.

WILLIAMS Sure. My name is Chris Williams. I'm an attorney for TODAL, LLC. My business address is 39395 West 12 Mile Road, Suite 200, Farmington Hills, Michigan, 48331.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you. Last time you were here, you gave us some background information on your project. We requested additional information in areas such as signage, plans for parking, more detailed floor plans for the proposed project, and also any changes or modifications to the building as well. So I see you did provide some information.

WILLIAMS We did. We provided a-- and again, just to be clear, I've got special permission today to represent TODAL, LLC. TODAL is engaged in a sale to Life Church Livonia, and our firm is also representing Life Church Livonia, but since that time, since the last meeting, a site plan has been submitted. It shows the proposed sanctuary, the parking requirements. What's also been submitted is a plan related to the signage as well as sort of a narrative on kind of the general thoughts on the usage of the property, both during the week and on Sunday mornings.

BARINGHAUS Okay. Can you give us some details on the general use of the property during the week, apparently, between the church and existing business operations in the facility.

WILLIAMS Yes, so there's currently two tenants. There's actually one tenant that's occupying, I'm not certain if the second tenant is actually occupied, but the current tenant, they use the space. They've got a secretary who's on site Monday through Friday, and then nine employees who come into the office to get daily [inaudible] and then leave. So there's maximum of 10 people for that tenant briefly during the week. The other tenant, the anticipated thought process is that there would be two people there on that property. As far as the church usage during the week, I think we're anticipating a staff of approximately five people. And then the hope is that there would be Bible studies, or perhaps like an Alcoholics Anonymous-type meeting there that would sort of work its way up to probably a maximum of 30 people. That would probably be starting like the 10 to 15-type numbers.

BARINGHAUS I was seeing the plan, some... like an auditorium in place, offices, meeting rooms, things like that, with the other areas of the building. 38303, 383...021, 029, what are the plans for those?

WILLIAMS So let me take a look at that.

BARINGHAUS There's [inaudible].

WILLIAMS Yeah, there's two. There's currently, like I said, there's two spaces that are currently under lease, and there's the potential for the building of the space that's to the I guess this would be the west. The large space to the west would also potentially be leased at some point in the future.

BARINGHAUS Okay. So those would be entities outside of the church operations?

WILLIAMS Right. And so there's basically an opportunity for three tenants there. There's two currently.

BARINGHAUS When I was there today, I noticed on the monument sign there was only one business listed, which is Roofing Technologies Ltd.

WILLIAMS That's one of the tenants.

BARINGHAUS Okay, the other one, you're not sure if they're still under or not.

WILLIAMS There was a lease that was negotiated. I don't know if they take an occupancy at this point.

BARINGHAUS Okay. Thank you very much. Questions? Okay then, just to follow up, you did mention... I did see some signage information in your package. You can give us a description of that?

WILLIAMS Okay, so the signage shows what they would like to do, which is they have a wall sign. Trying to find the signage here. So if you look at what was presented, this shows this is actually like the church in Canton. I believe this is the building for them. It shows up in the upper left-hand corner there, sort of the sign that would be, which is also at the top of the document there. So the total square footage of that, I think, is around 31 square feet. In an M-2 district, I think you can go to 100 square feet. So the plan there is just to fully comply with the zoning ordinance in terms of the wall sign.

BARINGHAUS Okay, so this is a plan design. There's been no efforts on applying for it at this point.

WILLIAMS Not at this point, as your colleague referenced. I mean, at this point, we need to get the variance approved so that we can actually acquire the property, and then obviously, there'll be further approvals. I'm sure they include permitting, construction and all those sorts of things.

BARINGHAUS In terms of parking, what arrangements do you see there?

WILLIAMS So the parking... there's a couple things. I mean, when we... the site plan that we presented showed a sanctuary of 250 people, the standard of the ordinance is divide that by three, essentially. We expect roughly 30 volunteers. As a practical matter, we never expect to get up to 250 people attending. I mean, the normal process is that once you get to about 70 or 80% capacity, you start looking at having a second service, because people simply aren't going to count if it's completely maxed out. So we're very comfortable with the parking that's there. There's actually a reciprocal easement that allows for another six spaces with the property to the south and the church is actually currently in negotiations with the property manager there to talk about the possibility of having even further greater parking usage. But as of right now, I think they're looking at, I want to say, 125 attenders, something like that, 125, 150 on a given Sunday. So they're very comfortable with the parking that's there. They're fully aware, you know, they'll need to have like a parking team there to guide people in and make sure they're properly parked and can get out. So this is a church plant. As part of the larger organization, so they're familiar with these processes.

BARINGHAUS Did you look at any plans for any future shuttle operations? [Inaudible] other venues?

WILLIAMS I mean, I think the property to the south is the most natural fit, because I don't think you'd have to have a shuttle, but if it ever got to that point, they would certainly have to look at some other options. But I think with the parking that's on site, with the potential of the property to the south, that's not an immediate, near-term concern.

BARINGHAUS Okay, great, very good. Thank you. Any other questions?

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN Question for Mr. Winkler. In the package, there's [an] addendum from Mr. Williams to Mr. Stierna dated November 13, 2024. It summarizes a bunch of the issues that the Board had at the last meeting, including the parking, signage, usage. Is there anything in that supplement that would have to come before this Board again, if they were approved on these variances?

WILLIAMS I'm sorry to interrupt, that's not actually from myself.

BOLOVEN Oh, I'm sorry.

WILLIAMS I know my name is Chris. There is a there's another individual, Chris Garvey, who works with the church. That's actually from the church.

BOLOVEN My apologies. Chris Garvey. Yes, that was sent in supplement to Mr. Stierna. Are there any items addressed on there based on their intentions in that supplement that are going to come before this Board again?

WINKLER In the future I'm not sure. The biggest question might be for Mike Fisher. This is an M-2 district which has certain parking requirements based on, if you decide to change the zoning for this church to be allowed there, which would put it into like a C-1, C-2 district. So the parking space issue is much different in those two cases. I'm not sure how, in the past, Law and Planning has ruled on how you want to handle the parking situation for that. That's one of the big issues here. And so that would be a question for Mike, as far as that goes, and if we could iron that out.

FISHER Well, yes, there's no question parking is probably the biggest single issue in this case before us, and the typical way we deal with these, with every requirement, is we take the most favorable to the Petitioner way of calculating it.

WINKLER Okay.

FISHER I still think they're probably short, but I'll leave that to you guys.

BOLOVEN So all this is doing is creating a potential future issue, it seems. Is that correct?

WINKLER Parking if they get a lot of attendance at one time? Yes.

BOLOVEN So the parking is going to be, I mean, let me take a step back. The use variance, right now, it's an M-2 but the parking regulations, is it still M-2 parking that they're subject to, or is it under their view? Which would be, I guess, C-1. Is that what...?

WINKLER Well, and that's why we're trying to decide that right now. We're trying to decide which zoning we're going with here.

FISHER We're not changing the actual district.

BOLOVEN Correct.

FISHER The only way we have to decide this is like I say, we typically use whatever is the most favorable to the Petitioner, the most favorable way to calculate. And I don't have the components of calculation, so I don't know.

WINKLER So in that case, based on their proposed seating of 348 they are looking at--

WILLIAMS That's not correct. There was... just to clarify. There was a previous site plan that was submitted that had a larger sanctuary, but there was a second site plan that only had 250 people. So if you use that to do calculations, you're going to come up with lower vehicle numbers.

BOLOVEN I guess, long story short, if we approve today, there's a good chance they're going to go through the process and actually come back here.

WINKLER I'm unsure about that. They've proposed.... If it's 250 seats in the sanctuary, they're only looking at needing 84 parking spaces.

BOLOVEN It will all go through Inspection, part of the permitting process.

WINKLER Right. And they have the sufficient parking currently on site from Matt Stierna, his email and his visit there, they have somewhere in the neighborhood of 115 parking spots, give or take. So if they are only required to do 84 that won't be an issue at that point. So that won't come back in front. It's basically if we're going to allow a religious institution inside of a manufacturing district, that's—

BOLOVEN Sure.

WINKLER --What we're, you know....

BOLOVEN I'm just going to the next step, because it seems like they've given -- which the Board requested the last meeting -- and they did a good job summarizing those issues, especially the parking and the signage and the usage. My thought was, why not address it now? But it seems like it just....

WINKLER We will approve it in the Planning Department and Building Department based upon your recommendation for the zoning that we look at it as.

BOLOVEN But we don't know if there's a violation. Nobody can, as of today's date.

WINKLER We can't tell.

BOLOVEN Okay.

WINKLER Ideally, that can be worked out between the Building Department and the tenant in that space.

BOLOVEN Thank you, Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS So just to recap. There was a second site plan submitted with a smaller sanctuary of 250 congregants.

WINKLER Correct.

BARINGHAUS Okay, based on that 250 number, 84 spaces—

WINKLER Correct.

BARINGHAUS --Were required against a natural number of 115?

WINKLER I believe so, yeah, right around there.

WILLIAMS Yeah, that's right.

BARINGHAUS So based on that, they're within parameters.

WINKLER Correct.

FISHER You may have solved some of your problems and potentially prevent any reason to return if your conditions on your variance tonight, at issue one cover these situations. In other words, presumably, I mean, I don't want to tell you what to do, but presumably you'll adopt the site plan they've submitted, so that will point in the direction to how many parking spaces you need, and if I hear Zac correctly, you're going to be compliant if you have that.

BOLOVEN So I guess that's my question. What's in front of the Board right now? Is it just the use variance, or is it the whole package? Are we looking at signage? Are we looking at parking? Doesn't seem like that's been evaluated yet for this Board.

FISHER Like, I say, you're gonna want to use conditions, I think, to establish your approval. And if not, all makes sense. So, for example, they propose just compliant signage. So you put it in their condition, "just compliant signage." And you'll also want to, like, I say, adopt their most recent site plan. And I think, if I hear correctly, if they adopt that site plan, you're good from our standpoint.

WINKLER That is correct.

BOLOVEN Okay, and this is the 10-22-24 site plan?

WILLIAMS I believe that's correct.

BOLOVEN Thank you, Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Thank you.

TESTA Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Mr. Testa.

TESTA Question for the Petitioner. I hadn't... I had noticed, to be clear, that there were two site plans in there. I didn't notice the difference in them until the discussion just now.

WILLIAMS Right.

TESTA So I do have the site plan that shows the 325 seats open. I just maybe want to clarify what's the background to come back and reduce to 250, was it to get into compliance with the parking?

WILLIAMS That's correct.

TESTA Or did your needs change?

WILLIAMS The needs did not change. I mean, I think that when they were preparing the site plan, they were assuming the greatest possible usage potential. But after getting some feedback in the Building Department, they realized that in order to get into compliance, that we need to have a more appropriate number.

TESTA Okay, in the more appropriate number 250, you guys feel long term. That's a number you can—

WILLIAMS Correct.

TESTA --Stay within.

WILLIAMS Correct, because again, we're talking about Sunday morning usage, and if, for some reason, we get up to 70, 80% capacity, you're gonna be looking at having a second service happening at that point. So it'd be quite some time before, and quite a lot of growth in the church before this would ever, ever become an issue. And like I said, even now, they're still having conversations with the building to the south, where there's already some easement there related to some of the parking, that they're already having those conversations now. So this is... as a practical matter. There's very little concern that the parking-- and they wouldn't purchase the property if they were concerned about the parking there, just simply wouldn't do it.

TESTA All right, thank you. And are there any concerns from the Petitioner, if we approve this with conditions such as conforming signage, and also to the prints, as proposed? Do you have any concern?

WILLIAMS No.

TESTA You're comfortable enough with these drawings that you're not going to see a need to deviate and change your site plan?

WILLIAMS No. Yes, we're comfortable.

TESTA Thank you.

SCHEEL Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yes, Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL So I'm not sure if this would be directed to Mr. Fisher or to the rest of the Board, but since I wasn't at the last meeting, I just want to verify, is the zoning waiver for just this part of the building, or is it for the whole building?

FISHER [Inaudible] the whole building.

WINKLER Well, they're looking at purchasing the entire property. So this would be for the entire property.

SCHEEL So it would be for the entire building. If we give the zoning waiver, is that going to put the other businesses in jeopardy?

FISHER Well, I guess that's another condition.

SCHEEL Okay.

WILLIAMS It should not. Again, well, the church will be the landlord of those properties.

SCHEEL But giving the zoning waiver won't put the other businesses out of...?

WILLIAMS No. I mean, if you look at the usage, which is slightly different for commercial space than it is for religious use. I mean, they would be... their maximum would be something like, I think 70 spaces, something like that. But they're using like 12, so, yeah, so it's, I think 72 so it's, it's well within targets. And again, we're talking about complementary use, when the tenants are using it, the church aren't going to really be using it and vice versa.

SCHEEL But I'm not talking about parking. I'm talking about use of the building. So the roofing company that's in there, would they be allowed to be in there with the new zoning?

FISHER Yeah, no, I understand your point. And again, I would say that's something you can generate by conditions here.

WILLIAMS Just to be clear, we're asking for a variance. We're not asking to change the zoning for the property. We're just asking for a variance, the specific use, to be able to have a religious institution in the space, but not to actually change the zoning for the property.

FISHER Well, her concern is that you now have two very disparate uses on this property. So that's why she's asking about the continuing viability of the manufacturing.

WILLIAMS Right. Well, again, I think their application states what we're asking for, which is the ability to have a church at that location, for a variance for that. There shouldn't be any impact to any of the properties. But if you feel there needs to be a condition....

BARINGHAUS So Mr. Fisher, the third condition you're suggesting is, "allow commercial operations within building where the church is located?"

FISHER The other portion of the site plan, other than the church portion.

WINKLER So continue to be an M-2 zone for the other three business locations.

FISHER Well, it continues to be zoned M-2 for the entire property. It's just that you want to, or maybe you won't want to, but I assume you're going to want to have the... is that the eastern part of the property? Whatever... whatever that is beyond that wall, beyond the back wall of the sanctuary, you're gonna have that area is be still subject to manufacturing use.

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yes, I'm sorry.

BOLOVEN Can I go?

BARINGHAUS Oh, please.

BOLOVEN Thanks. Mr. Fisher, what if it was religious use? Would that be C-1? I think that'll help clear up the resolution.

FISHER No it would be... I think we really just use R-1 in our districts.

BOLOVEN RUF, or?

FISHER Yeah. I would have to look that up because I would consider it non-conforming.

BOLOVEN We could just make the motion, if it is approved, to have that used for RUF, as well as M-2. Whatever....

FISHER Oh, to have the....

WILLIAMS Let me just raise one other issue too. I mean this, this is what, this is how this is currently being proposed to be used now, for the space to be the church and to have these other tenants there, but there is a possibility in the future that the church could expand into those other spaces also. So I just wouldn't want to do anything that would prevent that usage.

BOLOVEN We're trying. My goal is to try to come up with a proposal on one vote, but I'm trying to word a motion that would allow you to have the religious facility as well as not jeopardize the other M-2s that are already there.

WILLIAMS Understood.

BOLOVEN I believe this would be... Mr. Fisher is going to verify it might be RUF as well as M-2. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Any other questions? Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL One more.

BARINGHAUS Sure, please?

SCHEEL And would this be just for this tenant only? Would we make this variance just for this tenant, or would it stay with the building?

FISHER I think you're gonna want to have this be with the building, because it's going to be a church after this, and presumably the church might be replaced by a successive church.

SCHEEL Okay.

WINKLER Mr. Chair, if I may. So a religious institution can generally be in a C-1 through C-4 district looking at the zoning ordinance. So that would be the other option for a church.

BOLOVEN So I'm looking at the—sorry, Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Please.

BOLOVEN Mr. Winkler. I'm looking at the zoning map right now after Vision 2021, 2020 or 2021, whatever it is...

[Laughter]

BOLOVEN Whatever the numbers, it looks like.... So I'm at Six and Merriman, which I know that's all churches right there, and it looks like RUF. So I'd assume RUF would satisfy.

BARINGHAUS There's another church at Five and Newburgh.

WINKLER They are but waiver use is for that zone, I believe.

BOLOVEN So what would you prefer for a religious entity? C-1 to C-4?

WINKLER C-1 to C-4 is by code of ordinance.

BOLOVEN C-1 to C-4.

WINKLER Correct.

BOLOVEN Got it.

BARINGHAUS Do you agree, Mr. Fisher, or are you still researching?

FISHER You can go on ahead.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you. We'll proceed. Terrific. Are there any other questions for the Petitioner? Okay, thank you. Just hold on one moment. Does the audience have any comments they wish to make in this case? Okay, thank you. Mr. Secretary, are there any letters?

KLISZ There are no letters.

BARINGHAUS Okay, if you'd just make a closing statement, then.

WILLIAMS Just to recap, I think the church has looked hard at the parking situation and submitted a site plan that they feel very comfortable with that reflects parking needs. Again, they're just looking at for the variance to be able to have the religious institution at that location. As far as signage goes, I think they're certainly willing to comply with the zoning ordinance. Other than that, I hope it gets approved.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you very much.

WILLIAMS Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Appreciate it.

WILLIAMS Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Okay, well...

RAHILL Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yes... please go ahead.

RAHILL Just want to say thank you very much.

BARINGHAUS Sorry, your name and address, please.

RAHILL Alex Rahill, 9277 Knolson Street, Livonia, Michigan. Pastor of the church, and thank you very much for your time. And it's been great to collaborate over the last month and trying to get all the information in a timely and thorough manner and I hope that now we've satisfied that. In regards to the concern about the current tenants and future tenants and such, I just wanted to make two comments. We're not just looking to fill those spaces with any kind of manufacturing tenant, in any way that would harm the church or be dangerous in any kind of way towards children or towards teenagers who are spending time at our place. And on the other end of that, we wouldn't want to jeopardize any of the existing tenancy there. We want to partner with businesses in Livonia. We're currently leased space at Laurel Park Mall and partnering with the businesses there and enriching the economy of Livonia through community partnership is a value of ours. And so I just wanted to say, both in the current state and in the future, we'd be mindful of that. Either not just put bringing in any kind of tenant that would give us some kind of income, but not be safe for children and teenagers and folks to be around, or on the other end, seeking to violate the zoning in some way for our own benefit. So the partnership with the city, enriching the city, enriching the city by supporting local businesses, these are all values of ours. I just wanted to make that statement.

BARINGHAUS Very good. Thank you very much. Appreciate it. We'll close the public portion of the meeting and begin the Board's comments with Mr. Testa.

TESTA Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can be in support of this. I think it's an interesting use of the building. The location itself maybe is a little odd or its position, it's going to be a little cumbersome for people to get to coming from the north, but that's not, that's not my issue. I support this, but I am concerned about some of the conditions. I'm not concerned, I-- we need to be very clear on the condition we put on this, as Mr. Boloven alluded to with his questions, to not set up a condition which would be coming back for more variances. So that's why I asked if you were good with the signage as is and the drawings as is, how to navigate the existing businesses. I think we found a way to work around that. So I can support a motion if those conditions are within it.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN I agree with Mr. Testa, I'd be in support. My concern is, as it's changing, you don't want it to keep swinging back and forth, right? So you give an inch, it might take a mile. I want to make it work at the same time as presented. Great. Don't want them to come back as long as everything's in compliance, which, according to Mr. Winkler, it seems like it is. I'd probably put that limitation on there, though, for the M-2 based on the comments of the Petitioner, that if a tenant does leave and they don't replace it, if the church does expand that it then stays C-1, C-2. They can't go back M-2. I want to prevent that flip flop, back and forth. But all that, the other conditions that Mr. Fisher mentioned, I'd be in agreement with and be in support of the use variance.

BARINGHAUS Great. Thank you. Secretary Klisz.

KLISZ I agree. I think the plan is thoughtful. Again, we need to get creative, putting different things in manufacturing if there's vacancies, and the church has been here. I think the conditions will be key. And I will be in support.

BARINGHAUS Thank you very much. Mr. Rotondo?

ROTONDO Yeah, I appreciate the Petitioner coming back to us and answering the questions that we had in the first meeting, supplying the signage and the site plan, the parking. I can get behind this, and I'll be in favor.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Ms. Scheel?

SCHEEL I agree with everything my fellow commissioners said, I appreciate the conversation we've had back and forth tonight answering questions. So thank you very much for the additional information.

BARINGHAUS Great. Thank you. Yeah. I agree with my colleagues' comments. I think they stated everything. I was very impressed how the church addressed the concerns the Board had from the previous meeting. Excellent explanations on building layout, also the forecast for parking needs and also plans for future growth were reexamined and modified to a more realistic level. So again, I'll be in support of the variance. And with that, the floor is open for a motion.

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN Before the motion, I just want to ask Mr. Winkler. I'm looking at the zoning map. You said C-1 to C-4. So C-1 is local business. C-2 is general business. C-3 is highway services. C-4 is high rise commercial. I'm thinking just C-1, C-2, or would that be sufficient?

WINKLER That would be sufficient. I mean, within the code of ordinance, it does give them the option in any of the C districts. However, if you wanted to put that stipulation on that, that's....

BOLOVEN I just don't want to put something unnecessary or potentially raise issue in the future. So if I say a highway service or a high rise commercial building.

FISHER No, you don't need that.

BOLOVEN Right.

FISHER Just C-1, C-2 is good.

BOLOVEN Okay, thank you, Mr. Fisher. All right. Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yes.

BOLOVEN Let's give this a try. Resolved that the variance sought in Appeal Case No. 2024-08-29, filed by TODAL LLC, be granted for the following reasons and findings of fact: the uniqueness requirement is met due to location of the property in regards to its surrounding businesses. Denial of the variance would have severe consequences for the Petitioner due to not being able to use the building as a church, which is their prime purpose. That the variance is fair in light of its effect on the neighboring properties and in the spirit of the zoning ordinance, due to no neighboring objections. This property is classified as M-2 under the Master Plan and the proposed variance. So it is inconsistent with that classification, but we're granting it as a use variance. I don't know if we have a different use variance language, but I'll go with that. Further, that the variance be granted with the following conditions: One, that it's built as presented this evening, in regards to signage, parking, and use. Let's try that. Two, that it be in compliance with zoning laws for either M-2 or C-1 or C-2 specifically in regards to parking, signage, and usage. Three, that the Petitioner be allowed to use the property in addition to M-2 as C-1 and C-2. And if a[n] M-2 usage vacates the building and Petitioner uses the building for its own use, it stay either a C-1 or C-2 and cannot be used as an M-2 for that property. And that this motion is for the address, not just the Petitioner. I think I covered everything.

BARINGHAUS Is there support?

ROTONDO Support.

BARINGHAUS Support by Mr. Rotondo. Discussion?

SCHEEL I have a question.

BARINGHAUS Yes, Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL Did you state the date of the site plan that we're looking at? The 10-22?

BOLOVEN Thank you, Ms. Scheel. It's as presented in the site plan dated 10-22-24 in our package, specifically, which has occupancy of 250.

FISHER Is this page A-200?

TESTA That's what they both say, so we can use the date.

FISHER Oh, okay.

BOLOVEN Both. The date in our package is 10-22-24 but specifically the sanctuary seats is 250 on this site plan.

FISHER Okay.

BOLOVEN I don't know if A-200 is the drawing number, file number 24.21, I don't know if there's any other distinguishing factor from the prior submission.

FISHER Okay.

BARINGHAUS Okay. Very good. Any other questions or comments? Okay, very good. Secretary Klisz, did you want to read the conditions back so they were clear on that? And I do admire you for entering all of that.

[Laughter]

KLISZ I am so lost. You don't have it written down...?

BOLOVEN I did, I was going off of—

BARINGHAUS Here's what I have: build as presented....

KLISZ Right, build as presented as to signage, parking, and use for the site plan date of 10-22-24, with the occupancy of 250. Two, that it be built in compliance with zoning laws as it relates to M-1, or C-1, C-2.

BARINGHAUS Excuse me, shouldn't that be "M-2?"

BOLOVEN I'm sorry, M-2.

BARINGHAUS M-2?

BOLOVEN It's C-1, M-2.

KLISZ Third one, that the property....

BOLOVEN So that's for the tenant?

BARINGHAUS Yeah. Petitioner be allowed to use as C-1, C-2 with M-2 lessees. The property they occupy stays as C-1, C-2 should they vacate it?

KLISZ Okay, if M-2 leaves the property then it will only be used as C-1, C-2 thereafter.

BARINGHAUS Right.

KLISZ Then the fourth: the motion stays with the....

BARINGHAUS The motion stays with the property....

BARINGHAUS Okay, we're good now? Okay, everybody's clear? Yes, Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL I have a question. So when you said, if a person that's leasing it leaves and the church takes over that spot, then it stays that spot. But if the church doesn't take over that spot, can they find another person to lease that spot as an M?

BOLOVEN Yes.

SCHEEL Okay, just want to make sure.

WINKLER As an M or as a C-1, C-2, only?

BOLOVEN M-2.

WINKLER Okay.

BOLOVEN They don't occupy. If they occupy it, they can't go back. Is my intention.

WINKLER Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Okay. Motion by Mr. Boloven, support by Mr. Rotondo. Secretary Klisz, would you please take a vote?

RESOLVED: APPEAL CASE NO. 2024-08-29, TODAL, LLC, 38019-38035 Schoolcraft (Tabled on October 1, 2024): seeking to occupy a property in the M-2 (General Manufacturing) Zoning District to establish a religious institution, which is prohibited.

This Tech and Manufacturing property is located on the south side of Schoolcraft Road (38019-38035), between Waco Road and Newburgh Road, Lot. No. 117-02-0009-006, M-2, General Manufacturing, rejected by the Inspection Department under Livonia Zoning Ordinance, Section 3.17 (Permitted and Prohibited Uses),

be granted for the following reasons and findings of fact:

1. The uniqueness requirement is met due to the location of the property in regard to surrounding businesses,
2. Denial of the variance would have severe consequences for the Petitioner due to not being able to use the building as a church, which is their prime purpose,
3. The variance is fair in light of its effect on the neighboring properties and in the spirit of the zoning ordinance, due to no neighboring objections, and
4. That this property is classified as Tech and Manufacturing under the Master Plan, and the proposed use variance is inconsistent with that classification, but the Board is granting the use variance.

Further, that the use variance **be granted** with the following conditions:

1. That Life Church Livonia be built as presented on the site plan dated October 22, 2024 (with an occupancy of 250), as to signage, parking, and use,
2. That, subject to strict compliance with condition 1 above, each use be in compliance with zoning regulations as they relate to M-2 manufacturing lessees or C-1, C-2 religious institution lessees as appropriate,
3. That this is not a rezoning, but a use variance permitting religious institution and manufacturing uses to coexist on the site during what appears to be a transitional period,
4. If an M-2 lessee leaves the property and the church occupies that space previously held by the M-2 lessee, it will only be used as C-1 or C-2 (religious institution) thereafter and cannot revert to M-2 afterwards until such time the religious institution use vacates the entire property. However, if a new M-2 lessee takes the place of the M-2 who has left, the space may still be used as M-2, and
5. That the motion stays with the property.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Boloven, Rotondo, Klisz, Scheel, Rotondo, Baringhaus

NAYS: 0

Absent: Coppola

PASS/FAIL/TABLED: PASS: PASS

KLISZ Yes. Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL Aye.

KLISZ Mr. Rotondo.

ROTONDO Aye.

KLISZ Mr. Testa.

TESTA Aye.

KLISZ Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN Aye.

KLISZ Secretary Klisz votes aye, and Chairman Baringhaus.

BARINGHAUS Aye.

KLISZ Passes six to zero.

BARINGHAUS Okay, very good. Your variance has been passed six to zero. Congratulations, and good luck to you, and again, just please touch base with the Inspection Department for any final details. So good luck to you.

WILLIAMS Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you. Secretary Klisz, will you call the next case, please?

APPEAL CASE NO. 2024-09-32, 20132 Osmus: An appeal was made to the Zoning Board of Appeals by Brian Durand, seeking to maintain a permanent carport structure erected without permits while maintaining an existing attached garage, existing accessory shed, and existing barn resulting in excessive number of accessory structures and accessory area.

Number of Accessory Structures

Allowed: 3

Proposed: 4

Total Accessory Space

Allowed: One garage up to 720 sq. ft., one accessory shed up to 200 sq. ft., and one accessory barn up to 600 sq. ft.

Proposed: Two detached accessory structures beyond the existing complying barn and attached garage, totaling 265 sq. ft.

Excess: 65 sq. ft.

This Low-Density Residential property is located on the east side of Osmus (20132), between Pembroke and Norfolk, Lot. No. 099-99-0026-000, R-U-F, Rural Urban Farm, rejected by the Inspection Department under Livonia Zoning Ordinance, Section 7.09 (1) A (Maximum Size) and B (Maximum Number).

BARINGHAUS Thank you. [Are] there any questions for the Inspection Department? I do have one question indicated in the public notice that the carport structure was erected without a permit?

WINKLER Correct.

BARINGHAUS I've never seen the type of structure before. What? What would cause it to require a permit?

WINKLER The Planning Department, Building Department considers that an accessory structure.

BARINGHAUS Okay.

WINKLER I believe that Mark Taormina is working, possibly Michael Fisher is working on language in the next updated zoning to include the carports as an accessory structure.

BARINGHAUS Okay, very good. Okay, thank you.

SCHEEL But—

BARINGHAUS Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL But right now, it's not included in the...?

WINKLER Not to my knowledge.

SCHEEL But yet, it's a problem?

WINKLER It's excessive. It's excessive buildings on the property.

BARINGHAUS Okay.

SCHEEL Okay.

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair, I'm confused. It's not... why is this an issue, then? If it's not a[n] ordinance.

WINKLER It is an accessory structure on the property by definition.

BOLOVEN Carports aren't specifically defined?

WINKLER Correct.

BOLOVEN Understood.

BARINGHAUS Okay. The future revision will specifically call out...?

WINKLER That's the plan. Yes.

BARINGHAUS Any questions for the Law Department? You, sir, can you please approach the podium? Thank you.

BRIAN DURAND Good evening.

BARINGHAUS Good evening. Could I have your name and address, please?

BRIAN DURAND My name is Brian Durand, and my address is 20132 Osmus, Livonia, Michigan, 48152.

BARINGHAUS Okay, terrific. Tell us about your project.

DURAND What we have here is like you mentioned, the carport. We use it for our camper. We've had this up for seven years now, and I did not pull a permit. It's an open-sided structure. It's movable. It's non-permanent. About a third of the roof is covered with roof panels, and the rest... it's a purchased, manufactured structure from VersaTube, and it's basically to protect the camper. So what we're trying to accomplish with this variance is to leave the structure as it is since it's been there for quite some time, and I realize that we did not pull permits on this. The other issue is we have a shed that's maybe six, seven feet from.... I'm only

bringing this up just to be honest about situation, but the shed is a plastic shed. It's 49 square feet, rather than the required 40 square feet for a small shed. That in itself, is considered accessory, I would imagine. And we have a barn back that was existing since 1975 and an attached garage. So the variance is basically to allow another structure on the property. So I'd like to just address a few things regarding that. And I look at this as a unique situation, because our property is 100,000 square feet. It's 2.39 acres in total. It's completely mowed lawn. There's seven mature trees on the property. Along the property line, we have basically a wood line that divides the next property over. And our situation with the property is we have four adjacent properties that back up to my property. In length, we have 660 feet of property length and 160 feet wide. None of these properties are fenced in. None of them, they all back up to our property. And I did get signatures, and I actually have my wife here and two of my neighbors with me tonight. So the unique situation is the property size. And one thing I would like to mention, and I realize that this is basically the code situation. But 7.09(1) (A) states that anything under one half of an acre, you're allowed two structures. Anything over one half acre, you're allowed three structures, which would be our situation, anything over a half of an acre could be, I would imagine, anything... a foot, larger than a half-acre, ours is excessively large for the area. And there are large lots, but it's two to four times the size of everybody else's lot in that area, particularly so that being--

BARINGHAUS I'm going to stop you and ask two questions, when did you put the plastic shed up?

BRIAN DURAND That was probably around the same time, or before, because we were camp.... It's probably before, because we camp, and that's to store our camping equipment.

BARINGHAUS So the shed first, and then the structure for the trailer.

BRIAN DURAND Yeah.

BARINGHAUS The barn, that's the back of your property. There's two barn-like structures that I can see from the road. Is yours the red one?

BRIAN DURAND Yeah, that's ours.

BARINGHAUS Okay, go ahead. Thank you.

BRIAN DURAND I guess if we stepped into the hardship, it's basically to protect the camper. Where that's located is... I brought a couple pictures here. I'm sure you've probably seen the packet that I sent. But I wanted to just show a picture of... this is the camper's canopy. It's 150 feet off of Osmus's setback. We're 40 feet behind the house and 30 feet behind the driveway. It's directly behind the driveway for easy access for the camper. In the springtime, it gets a little wet, but this is basically the situation. I'm 15 feet from the property line. And, like I said, 150 feet off of Osmus. It's practically not even really noticeable, to be honest with you. And I just wanted to show this as a display of the property size. It's a very large piece of property.

BARINGHAUS Question for Mr. Winkler, is the trailer properly stored, in other words, in the rear, behind the home? Correctly? It's hard to tell where what's considered back there than that.

WINKLER Yes, there is no issue with where the trailer is placed. It's perfectly within zoning ordinance.

BARINGHAUS Okay, great. Thank you very much.

BRIAN DURAND I'll touch on a few other points here that I think are fairly important. I know I think will come up as probably an issue with precedence being, if we have it, then everybody else is going to want one, or whatever the case is. I've driven every street in this subdivision all the way down to Farmington Road, and I found one, and this has been in existence for seven years. We put this up in 2017, a year after we got our first camper. And it's been there that long, but I've only found one similar camper canopy structure such as that in the area. So.

BARINGHAUS Where is that, again?

BRIAN DURAND The other one?

BARINGHAUS The other one, yeah.

BRIAN DURAND I don't want to rat them out.

[Laughter]

BARINGHAUS We won't tell.

BRIAN DURAND It's somewhere near my house. It's on. It's on, actually, on Osmus also.

BARINGHAUS Is it? Okay.

BRIAN DURAND Yeah, but I was trying—

BARINGHAUS I saw it, too.

BRIAN DURAND You're looking harder than me, but I did drive that street looking for something.

BARINGHAUS Okay.

BRIAN DURAND Let's see, I gave you the setbacks and everything. Yeah, the canopy itself, I've got three inches of gravel under it. It's only been used to store the camper. There's...

it's not storage to keep junk or garbage cans or anything like that. It's a purchase kit from Menards, galvanized. I've got it on wolmanized two-by-fours, so it's not actually sitting on the ground. It's...

BARINGHAUS Is it anchored to the ground?

BRIAN DURAND Yeah, I've got five, one half 5/8 by 24-inch anchors through the wood and through the canopy base, which is galvanized steel, five on each side. Let's see, it's powder coated. It looks as good, it actually looks better than it did seven years ago. But this is actually the way it looks. It's the shed. This was taken not more than a few weeks ago. This particular picture, so I just wanted to show you that. And one thing I'd like to point out too is I talk about a hardship with the canopy itself. And weather, Michigan weather, just one example of this. When we bought this camper, the guy that we bought it off of had it under the exact same canopy. And I told my wife after the first camper, we had some water damage, and we didn't really know what we were looking for, and had to rebuild the roof in the front wall of the camper. I said, we have to do something. So we put a tarp over it. And it's not very appealing, and it's very difficult to cover something like that. So I said, "Let's just look into something like this." But we got this canopy in 2017, we got this camper in 2020, but the camper is in perfect condition. It's a 2013. We bought it used. But the front, the front detail on it, because it's exposed, is completely destroyed. And that's just being outside in the elements, in the sun. But the location of this off the end of the driveway is probably the least amount of trees over the top of it, if I were to push it back farther in the yard, or park the camper back in the yard, there would be a tree branch overhead.

BARINGHAUS So you're saying, I mean, most campers are stored outside.

BRIAN DURAND Pretty much.

BARINGHAUS Damage because of the trees around.

BRIAN DURAND Not necessarily. It's a possibility.

BARINGHAUS What's damaging?

BRIAN DURAND Just the weather. Usually you get water damage to the ice, the snow, the cold, the heat, the sun.

BARINGHAUS How tall is the camper?

BRIAN DURAND How tall? It's actually a shorter one, because in order to fit it under this canopy that we had for the other camper, it was only a 14-foot, we found them with an air conditioner unit that's a side model, so it's not on the top. But overall, the camper's probably maybe eight feet tall.

BARINGHAUS Eight feet tall.

BRIAN DURAND I think this might be 11 or 12.6.

BARINGHAUS When you're considering joints, protected storage like that. Did you look at any alternatives, like a garage to store it inside?

BRIAN DURAND No, it's.... The barn is a two-story, or the garage in the back is two-story, and the door is only a seven-foot-high door. So there's no possible way.

BARINGHAUS [Inaudible] extension to attach to the garage?

BRIAN DURAND No, there's no way. There's no way it will fit. Actually, the attached garage is separate with two separate doors, two seven-by-eight doors, so... but yeah, there's no way it would fit inside.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Are there any other questions from the Board?

TESTA Yeah, Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Mr. Testa.

TESTA How did this get here tonight, did Inspection find this, or did someone call on you, or...?

BRIAN DURAND Yeah, somebody called.

TESTA Okay. I think, for answering the question about why you can't park in the barn or in a garage, is very understandable. How did you select doing this carport-style thing, instead of doing, say, an addition to your barn or an addition to your garage, to fit it?

BRIAN DURAND Oh, cost, first of all, and probably just convenience. I mean, I don't have enough space to build onto the garage or the barn in the back to make it accessible for that, like it would have to be this. This is actually 20. It's 18 by 12. The footprint, 216 square feet. The camper barely fits under that. But if I had to build a structure that was 12 feet wide by 20 to fit the entire camper with the tongue and everything you're looking at, 28 feet, 26, 27 feet. So to build that structure, I don't... then we get into another structure in square footage.

TESTA Okay, how did you select the location? Why not put it next to the barn and, like, incorporate the carport off the barn?

BRIAN DURAND There's no roadway to the barn. There's not even electricity in the barn, to be honest. But it's directly off of our driveway, like the driveway is right here, straight back. It's about 30 feet past the concrete.

TESTA Yeah.

BRIAN DURAND So it's 30 feet of lawn to drive on rather than....

TESTA Okay, so you are driving on lawn right now.

BRIAN DURAND Yeah.

TESTA You're just saying driving it back to the barn area would be....

BRIAN DURAND In the springtime, there's no way.

TESTA Okay.

BRIAN DURAND I also did get-- I included this in the packet, but I have seven of my neighbors have signed this petition, I would call it, stating that they have no issue. And like I stated here, I have two neighbors here with me tonight, but nobody really has any issue with this at all.

TESTA Okay, thank you. Question for Inspection, is the shed properly permitted, or?

BRIAN DURAND No, that's not permitted.

WINKLER Well, okay, so there was a 1975 eight by 12 accessory structure shed that was permitted that is no longer on the property. And then in 1974 was when the barn was permitted...

TESTA Okay.

WINKLER ...Which is still remaining on the property. So he did have an existing at some point, possibly before he purchased the property, there was an eight by 12 shed as well. So, you know, this wouldn't be, I mean, it's 216 square feet, and that's 16 feet over the 200 square foot limit for this...

TESTA Okay.

WINKLER ...Type of building.

TESTA So the shed itself, though, would be allowed under his current setup. It's smaller than what he had before, you're kind of grandfathered... I don't want to use that word, but.... yeah, okay. We don't need--

WINKLER It's very close. We would ask him to reduce it 16 square feet if he was to come in and ask for a permit for that structure.

TESTA Okay.

BRIAN DURAND It's one of the plastic Suncast sheds.

WINKLER Oh, well, the shed. Yeah, that's different. That's a seven by seven.

BRIAN DURAND Yeah.

TESTA Yeah. This... I'm asking about the shed itself.

WINKLER That wasn't permitted. He's nine feet over the exemption limit on that, and I believe he has expressed willingness to remove that in the past from my conversations with him, or to reduce it in size.

BRIAN DURAND The problem was when I bought that shed. And not making excuses for this, but shed sizes generally, like you get a seven by five or to get close to the 40, there really isn't anything. And the price of this one being nine square feet over, and it's no different than a seven by five Suncast if they have one, but they didn't have a 40-foot. This happened to be forty-nine, and that's really how I looked at that. And maybe a bad decision on my part, I don't know, but we store all of our camping stuff in that shed, so it's very convenient, and it's a decent size.

TESTA The shed has been longer there, longer than the carport?

BRIAN DURAND I'm gonna say it probably, if it was there before it was within a year.

TESTA Okay, and how many days, roughly, per year is the camper not on site?
So in use?

BRIAN DURAND Probably five to six weekends.

TESTA Okay.

BRIAN DURAND I would say average camping time somewhat longer than a weekend, four to five days.

TESTA Generally, that shed is obstructed by the camper?

BRIAN DURAND Mmhmm.

TESTA Okay.

BRIAN DURAND It definitely is, on the photo right here. So it is, it is directly behind it. So, I mean, from the road, you can't even see the shed with the camper there. Other than that, when the camper is gone, it's a big open space.

BARINGHAUS Question for the Inspection Department. At this point, there are two units that need permits, the carport and the plastic shed?

WINKLER There would be, correct, but at the same time, we wouldn't. We would tell him he could not have both those structures on the property either, unless he reduced one in size to underneath the exemption limit, which is 40 square feet.

BARINGHAUS Are there any other questions from the Board?

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yes, Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN One quick question for the Petitioner. You said you bought this, premanufactured, installed it.

BRIAN DURAND I did. We did. My wife, her son, and myself.

BOLOVEN Thank you.

BRIAN DURAND They're pretty common. You see them up north a lot. Larger farms and farms use them, and car storage and whatever. So, yeah, it was purchased as a kit.

TESTA Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Yes, Mr. Testa.

TESTA I have another question. So from your pictures and from your description, the trailer is larger than your carport, correct?

DURAND The box of the trailer fits under it. The front tongue sticks out a little bit out of the front.

TESTA And this is your second trailer. Before you had a smaller one that fit better.

BRIAN DURAND Better. Yeah, we had to get this camper so we could, didn't have to do any alterations or anything to the carport.

TESTA Can you foresee yourself buying a bigger...?

BRIAN DURAND No.

TESTA Motorhome in the future and expanding your current carport?

BRIAN DURAND No, you can ask my wife, she loves this camper. We don't need anything bigger. So it would never, I could say this, the space will be used only for a camper. It'll never be anything else under that space and strictly for the camper, not for any other storage. And, yeah, we don't intend on getting a larger camper.

TESTA Okay, would you have any concern, if we put some type of condition on a potential variance that it's to this exact size, meaning you can't expand it beyond what it is. And if you build a new one, you'd have to come....

BRIAN DURAND Absolutely, yeah, for sure.

TESTA Okay.

BARINGHAUS And a question for the Inspection Department regarding the plastic shed, are you recommending removal of it, seeing how it can't be reduced in size based on what Mr. Durand said?

WINKLER Ideally, he gets something 40 square feet or less. Other than that, I mean, as you can see in the pictures, you hardly even notice it's there. It blends right in. The property's pristine. He upkeepes it very nicely. That's kind of what the variance is, why he's here for that shed and for a little bit of extra size on the carport. I mean, they're just both slightly over.

BARINGHAUS Very good. Okay, great. Thank you.

TESTA Sorry, Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Sure, please.

TESTA One more question. when you were speaking to start, I may have missed it, what was the reason you did not pull a permit?

BRIAN DURAND There isn't any language on carports in Livonia Code, first, but I just assumed... it's not a permanent structure. It's, I mean, typically it could be moved. It wouldn't be easy to move it, but it's open-sided. It's not necessarily.... It is an accessory building, but it's not an enclosed building. There's no doors on the front, no doors on the back. One third of the roof is covered. Those sides from probably six feet down are wide open, the front. Yeah, but yeah, just because it was non-permanent and open-sided I, you know....

TESTA Okay, thank you.

BRIAN DURAND My reasoning.

BARINGHAUS Any further questions? Okay, thank you. If you just stay there for a moment. Does the audience have any comments regarding this? Come forward, please. I'm sorry, you can sit down for a moment.

BRIAN DURAND Okay.

BARINGHAUS Thank you.

SILYE Good evening.

BARINGHAUS Hey, good evening. Can I have your name and address, please?

SILYE My name is Ronald Silye. I live at 20101 Osmus, Livonia, Michigan, 48152. I live across the street and a couple of houses south of Brian. Brian and Kathy have been exemplary neighbors since they've been in the neighborhood. As you saw, the lot is very well taken care of. My wife and I have no issue at all with the way the property is laid on the city, well over two acres. So I think the better nine square feet difference shouldn't be that big a deal. And we would just ask that you approve his request for the variance.

BARINGHAUS Okay, very good. Thank you.

SILYE Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Anybody else? Please, sir. Oh, and then, sorry.

WATMORE Hello. My name is Mark Watmore. I live at 20164 Osmus Street, Livonia, Michigan, 48152. I'm actually Brian's next-door neighbor. We moved in after Brian. We've been there probably about seven years now, and the carport's always been there. As far as we're concerned, the small shed that sits there... normally when the trees have leaves, you can't see it because it blends right in. And as far as the way the land is set down there, there's an old waterway that runs through the back. So it is, at times very, very swampy in the back part before you get to the shed, to that barn in the back. So as far as moving and putting it back there, it wouldn't be accessible for most of the year with the way that ground is. As far as we're concerned, it's not an eyesore in any way, shape, or form. It'd be much worse if you had something back there with blue tarps all over. So we have no issues at all. And I don't think anybody in the neighborhood, with the exception of one individual that was throwing 1000s of complaints at you guys, you know, so I don't see any reason it shouldn't stay. Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you.

KATHY DURAND I'm Kathy Durand.

BARINGHAUS Please step to the podium. Please. Name and address?

KATHY DURAND Good evening. Kathy Durand, Brian's wife, I echo everything my husband said, and my neighbor said, and my husband's a tradesman. Everything he does, he does top notch. It's not going to be falling apart or incorrect. He's a perfectionist. I would ask that this variance be approved just because we're only doing what we have done with our property since day one, and that's to protect our own, keep it the best we can keep it and the nicest esthetically, we're very esthetic people. The reason the canopy went up is because it looks better and it serves the purpose of protecting our property and everything on our property we have made better or more beautiful, because that's what we do. That's what we think Livonia stands for. And I just hope that you take into consideration everything we brought forward tonight, because it means a lot to us.

BARINGHAUS Okay. Thank you very much.

KATHY DURAND Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Any other comments from the audience? Okay, thank you. Secretary Klisz, are there any letters?

KLISZ Yes, we have two letters, letter of approval, Frank Ledda and Antonina Ledda, (20070 Osmus; letter was read). A letter of approval from K. Kreger, 31655 Norfolk Street (letter was read).

BARINGHAUS Okay. Thank you very much.

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yeah.

BOLOVEN Sorry. I know the Petitioner mentioned that he had a petition or something signed. Did he turn that in, or...?

KLISZ (Neighbor petition was read) And then it's signed by Neil Worden, Mike and Kandra Welch, Bruce Schwartz, Mark Watmore, Dion Hardy, Jonathan Riley, Ronald Silye.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you very much. Mr. Durand, would you like to make a closing statement?

BRIAN DURAND Yeah, I'm just going to read this here. See all this being said. We would like to ask for your consideration in allowing us to leave the canopy shelter in place, as is. We understand fully the issue with allowable storage and number of allowable accessory structures,

along with the square footage allowed by the Livonia Code Enforcement. We believe that because of our unique situation concerning our property dimension, along with full neighborhood support and the structure being in place for seven years with no incident, prior complaints, or safety concerns, that this is a legitimate and reasonable request, and I thank you so much for your time and consideration.

BARINGHAUS Thank you very much. We'll close the public portion of the meeting and begin the Board's comments with Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL Hi, thank you for being here this evening, for explaining everything so thoroughly to us. I would be in support of this variance for both the shed and for the carport. I think the amount of property you have alone and the fact that it's well maintained and that you have such strong neighbor support goes in your favor. Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Mr. Rotondo.

ROTONDO Yeah, I could be in support of this as well. I think, obviously, with the size of the property is definitely unique to this situation. The port itself, I don't see as a.... It's not like it's a rinky-dink canopy that's temporarily put up. It's a solid structure. I've seen it for years. I drive by that area quite a bit, so I don't really see any issue with it. I can understand the need for it to protect your trailer, and it being near the driveway is that area is probably pretty wet during the spring, so I have no issues with it.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Secretary Klisz?

KLISZ I agree. I think the two things to consider would be, if he were denied he could take it down and throw a big tarp on it instead of and that would look worse. So practically speaking, that. The other thing is, I would suggest a double permit fee. As we consistently uphold, folks who failed to get a permit in the first place have to pay a double permit fee. But otherwise, again, the other shed, I think is appropriate. And again, it's barely over the limit, so I think that would be my take on it.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you. Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN I echo what Secretary Klisz stated. The only thing I'd add is, it's a massive property. I mean, add that into the mix, if everything makes sense. So I'd be in approval.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Mr. Testa.

TESTA I'm also in approval other than I have nothing else to add on whatever was said. Generally we, I specifically, look negatively upon people who do something without permits and then come in, asking. But I think in this case, you explained well, and it's a reasonable explanation as well. I can understand why we're in this case, so I can support.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you. I too will support the variance. Again, I see your point. The property is quite large. I did see the red barn kind of on the horizon. Wasn't certain it was yours. But yeah, and it's also not uncommon in your neighborhood, as you pointed out, and as you and I discovered, one of your neighbors has a similar structure, and one or two of your neighbors just park their large trailers in the yard and go about their business. So I agree with Mr. Klisz. Well, it is our, I guess, position that when someone does erect a structure without a permit, we will request a double permit penalty be assessed. So with that the floor is open for a motion.

SCHEEL I'm not going to make a motion, but I have a problem assessing him a double permit fee when it was not specifically stated in the ordinance that a carport would be required for a permit.

BARINGHAUS Well as the Inspection Department pointed out, it is still an accessory building.

SCHEEL But if it's doesn't specifically say "carport," then how would the person know? I mean, we could say it's....

KLISZ They could call and ask.

SCHEEL But if it's not.... So I'm just saying.

WINKLER That includes chicken coops, as well as other structures. And people try to put carports on the sides of their home, which actually is not allowed either when they have a detached garage. There's numerous cases where they're asking for a carport, and if it meets the zoning criteria, we will grant them an accessory structure permit, a shed permit for it.

SCHEEL Okay.

BARINGHAUS Thank you.

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yes, Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN Resolved that the variance sought in Appeal Case No. 2024-09-32, filed by Brian Durand, be granted for the following reasons and findings of fact: the uniqueness requirement is met due to the size of the property, as in relation to the City of Livonia, the high acreage. Denial of the variance would have severe consequences for the Petitioner, as he would not be able to secure his camper. The variance is fair in light of its effect on neighboring properties and in the spirit of the zoning ordinance due to full neighbor support. This property is classified as RUF under the Master Plan. The proposed variance is not inconsistent with that classification. Further, that the variance be granted with the following conditions: that the carport

cannot be altered in regards to its current size, and that the Petitioner be assessed the double permit fee.

TESTA Support.

BARINGHAUS Okay, motion by Mr. Boloven, support by Mr. Testa. Any further discussion? Secretary Klisz, will you please take a vote?

RESOLVED: APPEAL CASE NO. 2024-09-32, 20132 Osmus: An appeal was made to the Zoning Board of Appeals by Brian Durand, seeking to maintain a permanent carport structure erected without permits while maintaining an existing attached garage, existing accessory shed, and existing barn resulting in excessive number of accessory structures and accessory area.

Number of Accessory Structures

Allowed: 3

Proposed: 4

Total Accessory Space

Allowed: One garage up to 720 sq. ft., one accessory shed up to 200 sq. ft., and one accessory barn up to 600 sq. ft.

Proposed: Two detached accessory structures beyond the existing complying barn and attached garage, totaling 265 sq. ft.

Excess: 65 sq. ft.

This Low-Density Residential property is located on the east side of Osmus (20132), between Pembroke and Norfolk, Lot. No. 099-99-0026-000, R-U-F, Rural Urban Farm, rejected by the Inspection Department under Livonia Zoning Ordinance, Section 7.09 (1) A (Maximum Size) and B (Maximum Number),

be granted for the following reasons and findings of fact:

1. That the uniqueness requirement is met due to the size of the property, as in relation to the City of Livonia, the high acreage,
2. That denial of the variance would have severe consequences for the Petitioner as he would not be able to secure his camper,
3. That the variance is fair in light of its effect on neighboring properties, and in the spirit of the zoning ordinance due to full neighbor support, and
4. That this property is classified as Low Density Residential, under the Master Plan, and the proposed variance is not inconsistent with that classification.

Further, that the variance **be granted** with the following conditions:

1. The carport cannot be altered as to its current size, and
2. That the Petitioner be assessed a double permit fee.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Boloven, Testa, Klisz, Rotondo, Scheel, Baringhaus

NAYS: 0

Absent: Coppola

PASS/FAIL/TABLED: PASS: PASS

KLISZ Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL Aye.

KLISZ Mr. Rotondo.

ROTONDO Aye.

KLISZ Mr. Testa.

TESTA Aye.

KLISZ Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN Aye.

KLISZ Secretary Klisz votes aye. Chairman Baringhaus.

BARINGHAUS Aye.

KLISZ Passes six to zero.

BARINGHAUS Okay, your variance has passed. So congratulations. Just touch base with the Building Inspection Department regarding paying your double permit fee and any other suggestions they have for you at that point as well.

DURAND All right, perfect. Thank you guys very much. Thank you so much.

BARINGHAUS Secretary Klisz, you are recusing yourself from this case?

KLISZ Yes.

BARINGHAUS Mr. Boloven will be acting secretary at this point. So, Mr. Boloven, will you call the next case?

APPEAL CASE NO. 2024-10-33, 27777 Schoolcraft: an appeal was made to the Zoning Board of Appeals by The Cornelia Group, LLC, on behalf of Lessee PAG Michigan 165, LLC, seeking to erect an 8-foot-tall metal picket fence along Schoolcraft Road resulting in a deficient front yard setback.

This Tech and Manufacturing property is located on the south side of Schoolcraft Road (27777), between Middlebelt Road and Inkster Road, Lot. No. 097-99-0019-001, M-2, General Manufacturing, rejected by the Inspection Department under Livonia Code of Ordinance, Section 15.44.100 (A) with reference to Livonia Zoning Ordinance Section 3.17 and 4.03 (o)iii.

Setback from Schoolcraft Road Right-of-Way

Required: 50 feet

Proposed: 0 feet

Deficient: 50 feet

BARINGHAUS Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any questions for the Inspection Department? Questions for the Law Department? Okay, will the Petitioner come forward, please? Good evening.

ANDERSON Hi, good evening. I'm Jeff Anderson. My business address is 2555 Telegraph Road, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan. We're Penske Automotive Group. We are the lessee of the site. Just a little background. We recently, in July, acquired Bill Brown Ford business, and as part of that, we needed a place to store a large number of cars that we're selling, on the order of 1500 cars. So in searching for sites, we found the site which was previously the Burton Manor site, somewhat blighted site, barely in business, so we've taken over that site. Now we've razed the building, and we're turning this into a large vehicle storage lot. The reason for the fencing is that we have 10s of millions of dollars of inventory on this lot. We need to protect it from being stolen or damaged. As you may know there's been car rings moving throughout the Detroit area, stealing cars, so we're very concerned about the safety of our vehicles. So as part of that, we want to secure the whole property and putting a fence across the front of this so that we could use the whole parking lot that exists today, is why we're asking for this variance. And there is a fence there today. It's kind of a decorative fence, but there is one in that location currently, and so we're asking for one that's a little more secure and the full eight feet tall that's allowed by the zoning ordinance.

BARINGHAUS In terms of the storage level, that just mean for the Bill Brown Ford dealership, or will that be it for the Penske service?

ANDERSON Only for the Bill Brown Ford dealership.

BARINGHAUS How many vehicles will it hold?

ANDERSON Well, we haven't finalized the parking layout, but it's going to be between 15 and 1800 cars.

BARINGHAUS Wow. Okay.

ANDERSON It's roughly 12 and a half acres.

BARINGHAUS Okay, and then tell us about the fence project you're proposing.

ANDERSON So what we're proposing is, so currently, today, there are masonry pilasters on about eight-foot centers, and then there's kind of a wrought-iron fence between them, and these are all roughly four feet tall. And so that's not very secure. You could drive a car right through that, especially a pick-up truck if you wanted to. So what we're proposing and what we've done on the rest of the site is, we have used concrete jersey barriers, which are three feet tall, and then on top of that, we put a five-foot chain-link fence, and that gives us positive control of the site. In this instance, though, across the front of the building, instead of putting a chain-link fence on top of it, we would put a decorative aluminum fence that would look like wrought iron on top of it. And then we would plant evergreen trees on a regular basis between every pilaster so that we can screen the fence as well.

BARINGHAUS This is along Schoolcraft.

ANDERSON This is along Schoolcraft.

BARINGHAUS Okay, very good. Is the lot manned 24 hours or is it just a standalone storage lot?

ANDERSON So it's manned during normal working hours, Monday through Friday, 7am to 6pm and then we have security guards during the evenings and on weekends. And they kind of, we have three of them on staff, and they rotate throughout our various properties, so they're not there fulltime, but they're there on a regular basis, every night and all throughout the weekends. Then we've also been in touch with the Livonia Police Department to help them assist, help assist us with that.

BARINGHAUS Okay, very good, thank you. Are there any other questions? Yes, Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL General question, so the variance is for the fence, right for tonight. That's just for the fencing. Will this go before the Planning Department for the plantings and everything that is going in front of the fence?

ANDERSON The answer to that is yes, we have to. We have to go and get a site plan permit.

SCHEEL Okay.

ANDERSON So, and it's not just that. There's storm water, there's parking requirements. [There are] various items that have to be approved as part of the overall land development.

SCHEEL Okay, thank you.

BARINGHAUS Mr. Fisher, I believe the variance request is fairly deficient setback from the right-of-way.

FISHER Yes.

BARINGHAUS Okay. 50 feet is required. There's none right now. So deficiency is 50 feet, and that's what the request is here.

ANDERSON Yeah. I mean, I think we're four or five feet off the setback, but it's not, definitely not 50 feet back.

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yes.

BOLOVEN Just a quick question. Mr. Fisher, the history of this, you know, looking at the May 4, 1992 resolution for Burton Manor, it looks like there was a fence approved with a one-foot setback. How is that in play here?

FISHER I actually don't remember our discussion on this, but I think part of it is, you totally eliminated the former use in the destruction of Burton Manor, if that's the right term. And you've got a different animal there now. So I think that was the thinking behind this decision.

BOLOVEN Decision to be here today?

FISHER Yes.

BOLOVEN Okay.

ANDERSON We were directed by the Zoning Department that we needed to get this variance.

TESTA Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yeah, Mr. Testa.

TESTA Question for Inspection. If they just push this fence back 50 feet, we wouldn't be here?

WINKLER Correct. They'll lose the front part of the parking lot. But yes.

TESTA How many spots would you be losing if you just conformed to the ordinance?

ANDERSON Maybe in the range of a hundred.

TESTA That's less than 10% of your overall.... Is that really a deal stopper? Well, obviously you're here, so maybe.

ANDERSON Yes. I mean, we, you know, we want to be able to use the whole parking lot that's there. There's a fence there today. Obviously, we didn't even think we needed a variance until we went in front of the Planning Department and they told us about it. But it seems crazy to have a fence 50 feet back and then have a parking area that's going to stay asphalt. It's going to look very strange. We kind of think this was a blighted site that we're making a lot better and increasing the value and look of it, so... and then obviously we're willing to do a lot more landscaping.

TESTA Sure, nothing existed at that location. Obviously you bought it from Bill Brown Ford. Where were they parking their inventory before?

ANDERSON They have two lots that they park their inventory on. One is the old Awrey's Bakery site.

TESTA Yes.

ANDERSON And the other is a what's called contractor steel site. And both of those leases are 30-day leases, so we can be kicked off at any time with 30 days' notice. And so for us as our business, that's not an acceptable risk to take. And so that's why we wanted to acquire our own piece of property that we knew we would be safe with our inventory.

TESTA So if approved, you install the fence and start putting your landscaping, and you start using your new lot, you will give up the other two lots.

ANDERSON That's correct.

TESTA Okay, everything removed to here.

ANDERSON That's correct.

TESTA Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Okay. Any other questions?

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Yes, Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN Mr. Winkler, this would have come before you. One foot setback. Would this be here today?

WINKLER I'm not clear. One-foot setback for...?

BOLOVEN Instead of its zero setback right now, if it would have been one foot as the previous approval would have been, would it be here today?

WINKLER We would have taken into consideration what was prior there, and then have gone to Planning and Mr. Fisher as well for double checking to see if they could even put it in the same location, or if that was specifically for the Burton Manor only.

ANDERSON If I can comment on that.

BARINGHAUS Please.

ANDERSON So we actually are further back than one foot, because we are sitting just directly behind that fence. It's because we're putting our fence behind the pilaster, so we could have a full, solid fence. So we're probably three feet back.

BOLOVEN Which is funny because it's exactly what... the three feet closer to the building is actually in the resolution from 1992, so.... Alright, thank you, Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you. Any other questions at this point? Okay, very good. Obviously, there's no petitioners in the audience here. So you have any letters, Mr. Boloven?

BOLOVEN No letters.

BARINGHAUS No letters at this point, okay. At this point, we'll just ask you to make a closing statement.

ANDERSON Yeah, I'd just like to say thank you for your time and consideration this evening. You know, we want to be a business partner and a community partner with Livonia. We're trying to do the best thing, what we think is best for both us and the community. We're trying to make the property better. So hopefully you take that into consideration in your decisions. Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you. We'll close the public portion of the meeting now and begin with the Board's comments with Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN Thank you, Mr. Chair, I would be in support of this. I know it's a different use, but it seems like this was before the Zoning Board, back in 1992 and a fence was approved. I get the different use, but due to the needs, and I do believe it is improving the property, as the Petitioner had mentioned, I don't think the setback would be an issue as well, but actually this is going to go before Planning for other further review, so I'd be in approval as presented this evening.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Mr. Testa.

TESTA Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you to the Petitioner for clearly answering the questions. On the pre-read, I was fine with this, except I didn't quite understand why you needed this space. Now I understand and it blended in and consolidate[d], and I think it's going to be a good use for you and improvement overall. So I can support this.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Mr. Rotondo.

ROTONDO I think my colleagues summed it up pretty well. I'm in support of this as well. I don't see any issues with it.

BARINGHAUS Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL Thank you. I'm in support of this as well, along with everything that my fellow Commissioners have stated, and I think it's great that you brought your business to Livonia. Thank you.

BARINGHAUS Okay, thank you. I, too, will support the variance. I have 30 years of working with automotive dealerships, and I know that vehicle storage is a challenge every day of the week, and definitely from your standpoint, operating from two lots temporarily is a hardship. This will streamline things considerably for you. You're also taking steps to make sure that the front of the entrance is esthetically pleasing when you do it in Schoolcraft as well. So again, at that point, I'll approve the variance and the floor is open for a motion.

[Inaudible]

BOLOVEN Mr. Chair.

BARINGHAUS Mr. Boloven.

BOLOVEN Resolved that the variance sought in Appeal Case No. 2024-10-33, filed by The Cornelia Group, LLC, on behalf of Lessee, PAG Michigan 165, LLC, be granted for the following reasons and findings of fact: the uniqueness requirement is met due to location of the

property in relation to the expressway as well as its layout for access to vehicles. The denial of the variance would have severe consequences for the Petitioner due to lack of security for the storage of their vehicles. The variance is fair in light of its effect on neighboring properties and in the spirit of the zoning ordinance, due to no neighboring objections. This property is classified as... M-2?

BARINGHAUS M-2.

BOLOVEN ...M-2 under the Master Plan, and the proposed variance is not inconsistent with that classification. Further, that the variance be granted with the following conditions: that it be built as presented this evening, and it be reviewed by Planning, as mentioned by the Petitioner.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Is there support?

SCHEEL Support.

BARINGHAUS Supported by Ms. Scheel, is there any discussion? Hearing none, Secretary Boloven, will you take a vote, please?

RESOLVED: APPEAL CASE NO. 2024-10-33, The Cornelia Group, LLC, on behalf of Lessee PAG Michigan 165, LLC, 27777 Schoolcraft: seeking to erect an 8-foot-tall metal picket fence along Schoolcraft Road resulting in a deficient front yard setback.

This Tech and Manufacturing property is located on the south side of Schoolcraft Road (27777), between Middlebelt Road and Inkster Road, Lot. No. 097-99-0019-001, M-2, General Manufacturing, rejected by the Inspection Department under Livonia Code of Ordinance, Section 15.44.100 (A) with reference to Livonia Zoning Ordinance Section 3.17 and 4.03 (o)iii.

Setback from Schoolcraft Road Right-of-Way

Required: 50 feet

Proposed: 0 feet

Deficient: 50 feet

be granted for the following reasons and findings of fact:

1. The uniqueness requirement is met due to the location of the property in relation to the expressway as well as its layout for access to vehicles,
2. Denial of the variance would have severe consequences for the Petitioner due to lack of security for the storage of their vehicles,
3. The variance is fair in light of its effect on the neighboring properties and in the spirit of the zoning ordinance, due to no neighboring objections, and
4. This property is classified as Tech and Manufacturing under the Master Plan and the proposed use variance is not inconsistent with that classification.

Further, that the use variance be granted with the following conditions:

1. That it be built as presented, and
2. That it be reviewed by the Planning Department and/or Planning Commission.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Boloven, Scheel, Rotondo, Testa, Baringhaus

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: Klisz

Absent: Coppola

PASS/FAIL/TABLED: PASS: PASS

BOLOVEN Yes. Ms. Scheel.

SCHEEL Aye.

BOLOVEN Mr. Rotondo.

ROTONDO Aye.

BOLOVEN Mr. Testa.

TESTA Aye.

BOLOVEN Mr. Boloven votes aye. Mr. Baringhaus.

BARINGHAUS Aye.

BOLOVEN Passes five, zero.

BARINGHAUS Okay. Thank you very much.

ANDERSON Thank you very much.

BARINGHAUS Thank you. Just follow up with Inspection, Planning, and thank you for your support for Livonia. Mr. Boloven, thank you for being Acting Secretary.

BOLOVEN You're welcome.

WINKLER It's not my place, but jersey barriers with the fence on top? I mean, I'm not supposed to offer an opinion, really, am I? Yeah, I don't want to bring it up, necessarily. I was just....

BOLOVEN I would wait until we're off the record.

WINKLER Oh.

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

TESTA Mr. Chair?

BARINGHAUS Yes.

TESTA Move to approve the meeting minutes for October 1, 2024.

BARINGHAUS Okay. Motion by Mr. Testa to approve the minutes from October 1, 2024.
Is there support?

KLISZ Support.

BARINGHAUS Support from Secretary Klisz. Discussion? All those in favor say, "aye."

The Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes from October 1, 2024.

BARINGHAUS Any announcements at this point?

BOLOVEN I do have one. The meeting schedule, the two things that popped up, and I don't know if it's changeable still? One: April 15.

BARINGHAUS Yes.

BOLOVEN If we do keep that day, I definitely will not be here.

BARINGHAUS Okay, we'll work on that one.

BOLOVEN And then the other one was learned from past history this year, the May 27 one is the day after Labor Day, sorry, day after Memorial Day. May 27 is the additional one, just in case, because we learned this year. It was the day after Labor Day this year, and it was rough, so maybe consider changing to the one after....

BARINGHAUS Any other comments on the calendar? I'll pass those along. And then I do have one announcement. The City of Livonia achieved a rather significant sort of a milestone this year. We want to recognize Chris Boloven for five years of service on the Zoning Board.

BOLOVEN Oh, cool!

[Applause]

BARINGHAUS And with that if there's no other business, do we have a motion to adjourn?

SCHEEL So moved.

BARINGHAUS Okay, do we have support?

ROTONDO Support.

BARINGHAUS Support by Mr. Rotondo. Discussion? All those in favor say, "aye."

The Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Gregory G. Coppola, Chairman

Timothy Klisz, Secretary